



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,691	12/09/2003	Kenneth J. Janik	884.002US6	3276
21186	7590 02/08/2006		EXAMINER	
	MAN, LUNDBERG, V	TREAT, WILLIAM M		
1600 TCF T 121 SOUTH	OWER EIGHT STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			2181	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/731,691	JANIK ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		William M. Treat	2181		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHI - Exte afte - If No - Fail Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE on the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we ture to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, or reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONED	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠ 2a)⊟ 3)⊟	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disnosi	tion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or				
Applicat	tion Papers				
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 December 2003</u> is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction to the correction of the correc	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objectodrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
2) 🔲 Notic	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:			



Application/Control Number: 10/731,691

Art Unit: 2181

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

- 2. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain <u>a</u> patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).
- 3. A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.
- 4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 13-24 and 33-39 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,691,222. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
- 6. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/731,691

Art Unit: 2181

7. Claim 20 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10 and 33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,691,222. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because dependent claim 20 is merely dependent claim 10 of the patent being made dependent from claim 33 of the patent. Also, the broader claim 33 of the patent clearly encompasses the narrower claim 20 of the application.

- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to William M. Treat at telephone number (571) 272-4175. The examiner works at home on Wednesdays but may normally be reached on Wednesdays by leaving a voice message using his office phone number. The examiner also works a flexible schedule but may normally be reached in the afternoon and evening on three of the four remaining weekdays.
- 9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WILLIAM M. TREAT PRIMARY EXAMINER

M 2- 4-

Page 3